

**ARKANSAS POLLUTION CONTROL & ECOLOGY  
COMMISSION  
ECONOMIC IMPACT/ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT  
ANALYSIS**

<b>Rule Number &amp; Title:</b>	<b>Regulation No. 15 – Arkansas Surface Open-Cut Mining and Reclamation Regulation</b>
<b>Petitioner:</b>	<b>Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality, Mining Division</b>
<b>Contact/Phone/Electronic mail:</b>	<b>James F. Stephens (501) 682-0807 <a href="mailto:stephens@adeq.state.ar.us">stephens@adeq.state.ar.us</a></b>

**2A. ECONOMIC IMPACT**

***1. Who will be affected economically by this proposed rule? State: a) the specific public and/or private entities affected by this rulemaking, indicating for each category if it is a positive or negative economic effect; and b) provide the estimated number of entities affected by this proposed rule.*** Implementation of Act 1020 of 2013 changes the time frames for approval and public notice of temporary variances and interim authority to operate. There will be no change in the cost for the review of the requests or the publication of the public notice.

*Sources and Assumptions:* Act 1021 of 2013

***2. What are the economic effects of the proposed rule? State: 1) the estimated increased or decreased cost for an average facility to implement the proposed rule; and 2) the estimated total cost to implement the rule.***

None

*Sources and Assumptions:*

***3. List any fee changes imposed by this proposal and justification for each.*** None

***4. What is the probable cost to ADEQ in manpower and associated resources to implement and enforce this proposed change, and what is the source of revenue supporting this proposed rule?***

No additional costs to ADEQ.

*Sources and Assumptions:*

***5. Is there a known beneficial or adverse impact to any other relevant state agency to implement or enforce this proposed rule? Is there any other relevant state agency's rule that could adequately address this issue, or is this proposed rulemaking in conflict with or have any nexus to any other relevant state agency's rule? Identify state agency and/or rule.***

None

*Sources and Assumptions:*

***6. Are there any less costly, non-regulatory, or less intrusive methods that would achieve the same purpose of this proposed rule?***

No

*Sources and Assumptions:*

## **2B. ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT**

***1. What issues affecting the environment are addressed by this proposal?***

None

***2. How does this proposed rule protect, enhance, or restore the natural environment for the well being of all Arkansans?***

The proposed changes based on Act 2010 of 2013 and the other changes proposed are administrative in nature and do not change the current level of protection of the environment.

*Sources and Assumptions:*

***3. What detrimental effect will there be to the environment or to the public health and safety if this proposed rule is not implemented?*** None

*Sources and Assumptions:*

***4. What risks are addressed by the proposal and to what extent are the risks anticipated to be reduced?*** None

*Sources and assumptions:*